

MINUTE ORDER

CORRADO V. NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM
12cv01748 (DLI)

This order summarizes the rulings made on the record at a hearing on January 14, 2016 regarding the motions to compel of defendant Ranieri and the individual New York State defendants. See DE 166, 167. Both motions¹ are granted in large part since, as discussed on the record, the discovery sought relates to matters pertinent to plaintiff's claims. However, a few requests are overly broad and have been limited. Because plaintiff did not number all her responses according to the discovery requests propounded, the discussion below of discovery requests is based on the numbering of the interrogatories and document requests of the individual State defendants.

1. Plaintiff must produce to defendant Ranieri those documents already produced to the other defendants, as previously ordered. The documents must be produced by January 21, 2016.

2. Defendants' motions to compel is granted as to interrogatories 2, 4, 6-9, 11-15, and 17-20.

3. Defendants' motions to compel are granted in part as to the following interrogatories to the following extent:

(a) Interrogatory 5 regarding medical providers is limited to disclosure of the providers who rendered services only from 2000 to present and need not include those medical providers from whom plaintiff sought only routine medical examinations, unless the services also included consultation for her general mental condition.

(b) Interrogatory 21 is limited to materials regarding plaintiff's employment with the Unified Court System or the allegations in the amended complaint.

4. Defendants' motion to compel is denied as to interrogatory 10.

5. Plaintiff must provide verified responses to the interrogatories.

6. Defendants' motion to compel is granted as to document

¹ Although Ranieri made a separate request as to production of documents previously produced to other defendants, which is discussed in ¶ 1, Ranieri essentially joins the motion to compel of the individual State defendants as to overlapping discovery requests.

requests 1, 2, 5-8 and 23 and plaintiff must supplement her responses. To the extent plaintiff contends that she has already produced documents responsive to a particular request, she must identify by bates number the documents produced that are responsive to each request. To the extent plaintiff contends that she has no responsive documents other than those she has already produced, she must so state clearly. To the extent she is unable to produce responsive documents which once existed, she must describe the documents and state the reasons why she is unable to produce the documents.

7. In light of plaintiff's discharge of her attorney, plaintiff's time to supplement her responses is extended from three weeks to February 18, 2016.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
January 20, 2016

/s/
MARILYN D. GO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE